

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Andrew Ridge	Team: Squad #8	CCRB Case #: 201708917	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Saturday, 10/21/2017 1:30 PM	Location of Incident: inside the 42nd Precinct stationhouse	Precinct: 42	18 Mo. SOL 4/21/2019	EO SOL 4/21/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Sat, 10/21/2017 4:57 PM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 10/26/2017 11:15 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. SGT Sindy Sanchez	00546	939761	042 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.SGT Sindy Sanchez	Abuse: Sergeant Sindy Sanchez threatened to arrest § 87(2)(b) <span style="background-color: black; color: black;">[REDACTED]</span>	

### Case Summary

This complaint was reported by § 87(2)(b) on October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2017, with IAB by phone.

Between November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017, and November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge place seven calls to § 87(2)(b)'s mobile number, which he provided to IAB when he filed the complaint. Each time Inv. Ridge dialed this number, he reached a male voice which was rapping with background music. Inv. Ridge was never directed to voicemail and so was unable to leave a message each time he called.

On November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge obtained two additional contact numbers from two of § 87(2)(b)'s previous CCRB complaints. Inv. Ridge called the first of these numbers on November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017, and reached a male voice who stated that Inv. Ridge had called the wrong number and that he did not know anyone named § 87(2)(b). Between November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017, and November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge placed two calls to the second number. Each time, a computerized voice indicated that the number was out of service. Inv. Ridge did not continue contact attempts to this number because upon review of the case from which this number was obtained, the investigator did not successfully make contact with § 87(2)(b) by using this number.

On November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017, a Lexis Nexis search yielded three additional potential contact numbers for § 87(2)(b). On November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge placed a call to the first Lexis Nexis number. Inv. Ridge reached a personalized voicemail which indicated that this number was the general number for the Bridgeport Correctional Center in Connecticut. § 87(2)(g)

On November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge placed a call to the second Lexis Nexis number. Inv. Ridge reached a male voice who stated that Inv. Ridge had called the wrong number and that he did not know anyone named § 87(2)(b). On November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge also placed a call to the third Lexis Nexis number. Inv. Ridge reached a personalized voicemail which indicated that the number was the general number for Antonozzi Associates. A Google search revealed that Antonozzi Associates is an architecture firm in Connecticut.

On November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017, a CLEAR search revealed two additional contact numbers for § 87(2)(b). Between November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge placed nine calls to the first CLEAR number. Three times that Inv. Ridge called the first CLEAR number Inv. Ridge reached a busy tone that eventually faded out and did not direct Inv. Ridge to voicemail. Six times that Inv. Ridge called the first CLEAR number, a computerized voice indicated that all circuits were busy, and did not direct Inv. Ridge to voicemail. On November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge called the second CLEAR number, and reached a female voice who stated that who stated that Inv. Ridge had called the wrong number and that she did not know anyone named § 87(2)(b).

On November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge located an additional contact number for § 87(2)(b) from an Event document, which § 87(2)(b) used to file his complaint with IAB, and which was separate from the number he reported as his contact number to IAB. Inv. Ridge reached a female voice, who identified herself as "§ 87(2)(b) the girlfriend of § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) provided Inv. Ridge with an additional contact number for § 87(2)(b). Between November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge placed seven phone calls to § 87(2)(b) at the number provided by his girlfriend § 87(2)(b). Each time that Inv. Ridge called § 87(2)(b) at this number, he reached a

computerized voice which indicated that the person being called could not be reached. Inv. Ridge was never directed to voicemail during any of these calls.

Between November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017, and November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge sent two text messages to the number § 87(2)(b) originally provided to IAB, neither of which were returned as undeliverable.

Between November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge sent two text messages to the number for § 87(2)(b) provided by his girlfriend, neither of which was returned as undeliverable.

Between November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge sent two text messages to the first CLEAR search number, the second of which was returned because the number was invalid.

Between November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017, and November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge sent three letters to the address § 87(2)(b) provided to IAB. None of these letters were returned by the USPS.

Between November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017, and November 17<sup>th</sup>, Inv. Ridge sent three letters an address for § 87(2)(b) from a prior CCRB complaint. On November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2017, the first letter mailed to this address was returned to the CCRB by the USPS as undeliverable.

Between November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2017, and November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Inv. Ridge sent three letters to an addressed which was discovered through a Lexis Nexis search performed on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017. None of these letters were returned by the USPS.

BADS and OCA searches performed on November 8<sup>th</sup>, 2017, yielded no additional contact information for § 87(2)(b)

A NYC Department of Correction Search performed for § 87(2)(b) on January 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2018, revealed that § 87(2)(b) was not incarcerated.

A State of Connecticut Department of Correction Search performed for § 87(2)(b) on January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2018, revealed that § 87(2)(b) was not incarcerated.

§ 87(2)(g)

---

Squad No.: 8

Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Squad Leader: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_  
Signature Print Title & Name Date